APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/259,620	02/26/1999	JAMES Q. MI	INTL-0160-US	5503

21906   7590   11/02/2006

TROP PRUNER & HU, PC
1616 S. VOSS ROAD, SUITE 750
HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631

EXAMINER
CALLAHAN, PAUL E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>19 September 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>39-50</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>39-50</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9-19-06

has been entered.

2.   Claims 39-50 are pending in the instant application and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments filed 9-19-06 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

The applicant argues in traverse of the rejections of the claims as found in the

previous Final Office Action in the case by asserting that Glasser '715 fails to teach the

features of providing a visual interface to a user in response to a request for

identification, so as to allow a user to accept or deny a request and prompting a user to

allow or deny a request. However, the Glasser reference was only used to teach a

server that displays a user interface in response to a generic user request so as to allow

a user to approve or deny the request. The Claus reference was used to teach the

feature of a request for identification. A review of the reference shows that Glasser does

indeed teach these features of a prompted interface display at the passages cited in the previous Office Action: (col. 4 lines 12-18, col. 7 line 40 through col. 8 line 40, claim 35).

The applicant asserts that Glasser fails to teach notification to a user of a second computer system of a request from a first computer system to identify itself to the first system. Yet Claus was used to teach the feature of such a request from a first computer system to a second, Glasser was used only to teach notification of a user of a generic request from another computer, not a request for an identifier.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 39, 41-43, 45-47, 49, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claus et al, US 5,120,939, in view Glasser et al., US 5,956,715.

As for Claims 39 and 42, Claus teaches a method comprising: receiving, over a global computer network (fig. 6), a request from a first computer system, remote from a second, coupled to the global computer network for a second computer system coupled to the global computer network to provide an identification of the second computer

system (fig. 1, step 3, item 700); the second computer system then provides a hash
value to the first computer system (fig. 2 step 4, element 563), the hash value being
generated by encryption of a key associated with a first computer system with an
identifier that identifies a second computer system (fig. 2, step 4, element 563). Claus
fails to explicitly teach, in response to a request, providing a visual interface on the
second computer system to notify a user of the second computer of the request and
prompting the user to allow or deny the request. Glasser does teach the use of such a
visual interface on a second system wherein a user of the second system is prompted
by a request from a first system to approve or deny a request (col. 4 lines 12-18, col. 7
line 40 through col. 8 line 40, claim 35). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of
ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the
system of Claus. It would have been desirable to do so as administrator-controlled
response to network requests allows for greater security in authentication protocols.
Motive to make this combination is found for example, in col. 1 line 45 through col. 2 line
2 where control of access to resources in a network is discussed. Claus teaches a
database associated with the first computer (col. 12 line 5-44: "Peer to Peer
Authentication", each computer has a database of secret codes)

As for Claim 41, Claus (fig. 6) teaches a networked environment in which two
computers communicate via a public switched network and therefore the use of URL's
is taught. Since the only information shared between the two computers is E_2, the key
necessarily indicates a web address.

As for Claims 43, 45 and 46, these Claims represent the computer program product embodied in a memory medium that when read out, cause the first and second computer systems to carry out the method of Claims 39, 41 and 42. Therefore Claims 43, 45, and 46 are rejected on the same basis as are Claims 39, 41 and 42.

As for Claims 47 and 50, Claus teaches a method comprising: receiving, over a global computer network (fig. 6), a request from a second computer system, remote from a first, coupled to the global computer network for the first computer system coupled to the global computer network to provide an identification of the first computer system (fig. 1, step 3, item 700); the first computer system then provides a hash value to the second computer system (fig. 2 step 4, element 563), the hash value being generated by encryption of a key associated with a second computer system with an identifier that identifies a first computer system (fig. 2, step 4, element 563). Claus fails to explicitly teach, in response to a request: providing a visual interface on the first computer system to notify a user of the first computer of the request and prompting the user to allow or deny the request. Glasser does teach the use of such a visual interface on a first system wherein a user of the first system is prompted by a request from a second system to approve or deny a request (col. 4 lines 12-18, col. 7 line 40 through col. 8 line 40, claim 35). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the system of Claus. It would have been desirable to do so as administrator-controlled response to network

requests allows for greater security in authentication protocols. Motive to make this

combination is found for example, in col. 1 line 45 through col. 2 line 2 where control of

access to resources in a network is discussed. Claus teaches a database associated

with the first computer (col. 12 line 5-44: "Peer to Peer Authentication", each computer

has a database of secret codes)

As for Claim 49, Claus (fig. 6) teaches a networked environment in which two

computers communicate via a public switched network and therefore the use of URL's

is taught. Since the only information shared between the two computers is E_2, the key

necessarily indicates a web address.

6.   Claims 40 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Claus and Glasser as applied to Claims 39, 43, and 47 above, and further in view

of Lee et al., US 5,774,544.

As for Claim 40, Lee teaches the features of the claim that the combination of

Claus and Glasser fail to teach, namely that an identifier that identifies the second

computer system comprises a processor number (col. 1 lines 12-23). Therefore it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

incorporate this feature into the system of Claus and Glasser. It would have been

desirable to do so since, as stated by Lee et al. in the cited passage, using serial

numbers identifying microprocessors allows for better tracking of a hardware

component.

As for claim 44, the claim is directed to the computer program product embodied

in a memory medium that when read out, cause the first and second computer systems

to carry out the method of claim 40. Therefore 44 is rejected on the same basis as

Claim 40.

7.   Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claus

and Glasser as applied to Claim 47 above, and further in view of Lee et al., US

5,774,544.

Lee teaches the features of the claim that the combination of Claus and Glasser

fail to teach, namely that an identifier that identifies the first computer system comprises

a processor number (col. 1 lines 12-23). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate this feature into the

system of Claus and Glasser. It would have been desirable to do so since, as stated by

Lee et al. in the cited passage, using serial numbers identifying microprocessors allows

for better tracking of a hardware component.

Conclusion

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3869. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's

supervisor, Emmanuel Moise, can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (571)

273-8300.

10-28-06

Paul Callahan

EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER